

friend from Ohio for yielding and for his leadership.

I come from the mountains of east Tennessee. We have a lot of common sense in those mountains. We understand when you spend \$3.2 billion, that's a lot of money. We have men and women all around America right now sitting around their kitchen tables trying to decide just exactly how they are going to feed their children, how they are going to take care of their families, how they are going to pay the tuition and buy that next tank of gas.

We talked about in the last election that we are going to be providing a change here in Washington. I believe the freshmen Republicans that came into Congress with me this year are here to offer that change. The way we offer that change is quit spending as much as has been spent in the past. We can do that.

When we have an economy growing about 3 percent and this bill is going to grow by 6 or 7 percent, people understand you can't grow government at twice the rate of the American family's income. It just can't be done. We need to make sure that we use some commonsense when we put these budgets together. We can't spend more money than the American people can earn.

I think the American people did send us here to Washington to rein in that spending, get a handle on our fiscal House. I think this amendment by my friend from Ohio will go a long way towards doing that. This is not about a cut. This is simply about holding the line on spending.

The American people can understand if they have \$100 this year and somebody wants to grow it to \$200 next year but you can't afford it, and you say, "I can't give you \$200, but I will let you keep your \$100," if you kept that at \$100, that is not a cut. That is staying the same. That is what this amendment does. This simply says we are not going to grow that \$3.2 billion.

I thank the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 12½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 17 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire, does the gentleman from New York have any additional speakers on the amendment?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that I have the right to close, and I am reserving to close.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, is he intending to close with a 17½ minute speech?

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI), a friend and freshman colleague.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have walked around the halls of the office buildings for the House. I have noticed the signs that talk about the truth needing to be told regarding the majority's budget that was passed, the claim that while there is no tax increase in that budget, and technically that is true, Mr. Chairman. There is no language in that budget bill that says taxes are raised on anyone in any manner. There is no claim there are additional taxes. That language is not in that budget.

But the effect of that budget, Mr. Chairman, will be increased taxes. Why do I say that? Well, because the majority has been very vocal throughout the last year, through the last campaign season, that by golly, one of the things we need to do is get our spending under control, get this deficit problem under control.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the problem is not taxes at this point. The problem today, though, is the spending, because if the spending continues at the rate we are going, that the majority is proceeding, one of two things has got to happen: Either we have to increase deficit spending or we have to increase taxes to pay for it.

I would just point out that about \$1 in \$5 for the budget last year was deficit spending, so how does the majority intend to avoid deficit spending at the same rate that they criticized last year? And, in fact, how will they avoid increasing that deficit spending by spending more this year unless they intend to increase taxes. At some point that choice has got to be made.

Mr. Chairman, it starts with the spending. If we support this amendment, that will be a start in the right direction.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, because the Democrats are so mesmerized by our presentation, we will continue. It is the first time I have known them to be speechless, but we will continue, and so I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Ohio for his leadership on this bill, and I am happy to come and lend my comments to the discussion.

Last year the Democrats got elected partly on the basis of their promise to cut spending. They made a big to-do about the fact that we were increasing spending. Republicans had done that. This is not cutting spending; this is holding the line on spending.

The eight appropriations bills that have passed the House so far are \$34 billion above last year's spending levels. That is not fulfilling the promises that they made to help hold the line and even cut spending. As my colleagues have said, this inevitably is going to lead to the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

Furthermore, in terms of this bill in particular, I have searched the Constitution and I see no role for the Federal Government in most of what is going to be funded in this bill. But the Democrats have never met a request for spending that they didn't like, and so they are going on willy-nilly increasing spending, putting the American taxpayer at risk, and increasing the deficit in this country; whereas, the tax cuts that were passed in 2001 and 2003 have led us to a very, very strong economy which we know is benefiting the American people right now.

Furthermore, none of the promises that they made about slowing the exploding growth of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid that would result in deficit reduction have been dealt with in this Congress.

We have simply got to come to grips with the fact that we cannot tax the American people to the level at which they are being taxed and the level to which the Democrats want them to be taxed. We have to hold the line on spending, and I support this amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for posing this amendment.

The reason we are here today, Mr. Chairman, is because this is over-budget. Take a look at this bill right here. It is \$2.8 billion above the President's request and includes a \$3.1 billion boost for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. There are also some phony gimmicks in this spending bill.

As noted, the bill provides phony offsets for spending increases by rescinding budget authority with no outlay savings. So what you are doing, you are actually canceling something that doesn't really exist to show paper savings so you can spend it somewhere else. Now, this is an old trick that has been done on both sides of the aisle over the years, but it still doesn't make it right.

The problem we have with this bill, as the preceding bills and the following appropriations bills, is it is \$34 billion above last year's spending level just for what we have passed so far. That is \$19 billion above the President's request. This majority's spending bills are going to be \$81 billion above last year's spending level.

When you look at the budget resolution, this bill does conform to the budget resolution. It meets 302(b). What that means in budget talk is they are conforming to their budget. But what does their budget do? Their budget leads to the largest tax increase in American history.

If you accept these spending increases, which, on average, are 9 percent spending increases for discretionary spending, three times the rate of inflation, three times the rate of